THE FAITH OF THE ANCIENT JEWS IN THE LAW of MOSES, AND THE EVIDENCE of the TYPES VINDICATED.

In a Letter to the Rev. Dr. STEBBING.

By JULIUS BATE, A. M.
Rector of *Sutton* in *Suſſex*, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. WILLIAM Earl of *Harrington*.

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold by M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-noſter Row*; and W. OWEN, at *Homer's Head* in *Fleet-ſtreet*. MDCCXLVII.

(Price One Shilling.)

THE FAITH OF THE Antient Jews, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

AS there is no Doubt but Dr. *Stebbing* ſpoke from the Sincerity of his Heart, when he ſaid, *Exam. of Mr. Warburton, &c. p.* 131, " Truth is what I ſeek, and " be it with me or againſt me, let Truth " prevail," I ſhall need no other Apology for giving you this Trouble, after returning my hearty Thanks for theſe two excellent Pieces againſt Mr. *Warburton*, as well as for your other Writings, which have gained ſo much Credit to the Author, and given ſo much Satisfaction to the World. I believe every Body admires the greateſt Part of theſe

two Pamphlets, for the Argument, the Stile, and the Decency of the Language; and it is no ſmall Point of Skill to take up ſuch a dirty Creature without fouling your Fingers.

I ſhall now beg Leave to lay before you ſome Poſitions of yours, which ſeem to me to bear, almoſt, as ill an Aſpect on Religion, as what that Puff of Vanity has himſelf advanced. You ſay, "That the Doctrine of a "future State of Rewards and Puniſhments "is no *conſtituent* Part of that Diſpenſation, "which was introduced by *Moſes*,—*Moſes* "as an authoriz'd Teacher, could not de-"clare the Doctrine of a future State (*a*)." "If it had been in his *Inſtitutes*, it muſt "have been in his *Commiſſion* too, in which "it's agreed it had no Place (*b*)." The "Sanctions of the *Jewiſh* Law were *tempo-*"*ral* only (*c*)," *purely temporal* (*d*). Look "into the four laſt Books of the *Pentateuch*, "and you will find Nothing but what re-"lates to the temporal Covenant (*e*)." You explain this by ſaying, "That the Covenant "with *Abraham* had two Parts; one the "Promiſe of a Seed that was to be a Bleſſing "to all Nations, which was the ſpiritual Co-"venant; the other, the Promiſe of the

(*a*) Exam. page 5. (*b*) Page 7. (*c*) Page 33. (*d*) Page 35. (*e*) Page 36.

"Land

" Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*'s Poſterity,
" which was the temporal Covenant; of this
" laſt *Moſes* was the Miniſter, but the *Ac-*
" *compliſhment* of the firſt——the *full Ma-*
" *nifeſtation* of it was reſerved for the Son
" of God, whoſe Province it was to explain
" it more perfectly." *See the two Pages cited laſt.*

" The general Turn of the Book of the
" Pſalms has an Aſpect upon temporal Things
" —There are *very few* Paſſages which
" ſpeak the Writers of them to have had any
" further Hopes—The Authors of this Book,
" and of *all the other* Books in the Old Teſ-
" tament, lived in the Age of the temporal
" Covenant, when God had made himſelf
" known to them under the Character of
" their temporal Deliverer and Protector;
" and what Wonder is it that in ſuch a Caſe
" —they ſhould make it the *principal* Sub-
" ject of their Devotions—as what the very
" Covenant itſelf had taught them would be
" the *firſt*, *immediate* Concern of his Provi-
" dence on *their* Behalf?—*Chriſt* has given
" *us* Directions to ſeek the Kingdom of God,
" and his Righteouſneſs (*f*)." " The Law
" of *Moſes* was given to the *Jews*, and did
" *prefigure* the Goſpel *State* in *many* of its

(*f*) Exam. Page 53 and 54.

" Appointments; which yet neither *was nor* " *could be underſtood*, till the Goſpel State in- " troduced, the *Reſemblance* was made to " appear (*g*)." And in the Hiſtory of *Abraham*, &c. Page 80, in direct Contradiction to all this, you ſay, " The Preſervation of the " Doctrine of a future State was the grand " Deſign of *Moſes*'s whole Oeconomy."

Theſe, Sir, and ſome other Paſſages which I ſhall produce by and by, I apprehend, want to be revis'd and reconſider'd, ſuch Conſequences flowing from them, as make the People of God more deſpicable than a Herd of Swine; for, if they were acquainted with the Doctrine of a future State, as you contend for, and yet made temporal Things the *principal* Subject of their Devotions, and were *chiefly* attentive to them, as the *firſt* and *immediate* Concern of Providence on their Behalf, they were worſe than Swine, in preferring this World to the next, their Belly to their Soul; and yet in this View you repreſent them. " The wiſer and better Part had " theſe Hopes (*viz.* of a future State) in " View (*h*)." And yet even Patriarchs and Prophets, all the Writers and good Men under the Old Teſtament, made the ſordid Pleaſures of this Life the *chief*, *principal*, and

(*g*) Exam. Page 151. (*h*) Page 54.

firſt

firſt Object of their Devotions to God. Your allowing, that " there was a ſpiritual, and " (Page 67 *evangelical*) Covenant, (Page 54) " ſubſiſting together with the temporal Cove- " nant, and under the legal Diſpenſation ;" and Page 103, " that all under the old Diſpenſa- " tion who have been ſaved, have been ſaved " by the Faith which Chriſtians *now* have, and " that they ſet *but little* by any worldly Thing," ſhews that you forget yourſelf, as you make them do the ſpiritual Covenant : and the Reaſon you give for their being *chiefly* attentive to temporal Things, *viz.* their being under the temporal Covenant, is anſwer'd by yourſelf, when you ſhew that the *ſpiritual* ſubſiſted together with the *temporal* : and the Scandal upon them of being *chiefly* attentive to *worldly Things*, removed by yourſelf, when you allow, that they *ſet but little* by any worldly Thing ; but then, Sir, this Inconſiſtency in your Way of Reaſoning, and Contradiction to yourſelf, demand a few Moments of your Time to enquire into the Reaſon of ; how little Leiſure ſoever you may have for *epiſtolary Correſpondences*.

Having vindicated the Prophets, Patriarchs, and Church of God, under the Law, from the Slur of making their Belly their God, as [*Phil.* iii. 19.] they do, *who mind earthly*

Things; let us ſee what the Religion or Law of *Moſes* is made by this Way of Talking; why! a *Puppet-Shew*. *Moſes* is the Maſter of the Shew; and *Aaron*, and the Prieſts, *Punch* and the *Puppets*; and the People a Parcel of Children gaping and ſtaring, while *Punch* and the *Puppets* play'd their monkey Tricks. This Farce was to be repeated in Miniature every Morning and Evening, and three Times in the Year there was to be a ſolemn Aſſembly of the whole Nation, under the Penalty of being cut off from the People of the God of *Abraham*, to partake of the Paſtime. You may think me ludicrous in this; but this, and no better, is the Caſe, according to yourſelf. The Law of *Moſes*, you ſay, had not, nay could not have any Thing to do with a future State: It was not in his Inſtitutes, and the Sanctions of his Law, are *purely*, *only* temporal: and that they did not underſtand the true Intent or Deſign of his Law; or know, [*though the Law did prefigure the Goſpel-ſtate in many of its Appointments*,] that the Types and Ceremonies were Deſcriptions of *Chriſt*, and what he was to do for them. Had they known this, they muſt have known the *whole* of Chriſtianity, and *Moſes* had not only taught them the Doctrine of a future State, as an *authoriſed Teacher*, but this Doctrine,

trine, and the neceſſary Truths that relate to it, had been the *whole* of his Inſtitutes, and *the ſole, chief* Subject, however, of his Commiſſion as a Teacher. I wave the Proof of this, and for the preſent, ſuppoſe with you, that as far as the People knew, the Types had no Relation to *Chriſt*; and what leſs is the Conſequence, than that their whole Church-Service was *to them* meer *hocus-pocus* Work? What Number of Ceremonies did it conſiſt of? Dreſſes, Waſhings, Sprinklings, and Punctilio's of a thouſand Sorts, now in this Place, now in that, which to them had no Meaning nor Intent; and they were called together from all Parts of the Kingdom, only to have their Faces ſprinkled with Blood, and their Hands waſhed with Aſhes and Water, and to eat bitter Herbs, heavy Bread, and ſo forth.

The Prieſt brings an Ox to the Door of the Tabernacle, kills it there, ſheds ſome of the Blood at the Foot of the Altar, ſprinkles the Altar, the Tabernacle, the People, and Himſelf with it; and Blood and Oil were to be put upon the Tip of the right Ear, upon the Thumb of the right Hand, and upon the great Toe of the right Foot, before the High-prieſt and his Sons were qualified to approach the divine Preſence, to offer the Sacrifice; which, (in

ſome Caſes) he was to cut to pieces, lift up one Part, wave another, take the Fat off the Inwards, make a Smoak with it, burn it, then pack up all the Pieces in the Skin, even its Dung, carry them out without the Camp, or City Gate, and make a Bonfire of it; return back to the Temple, waſh his Hands and Feet, pull off his Cloaths, and put on others, with a Variety of Gewgaws upon them, a Crown on his Head, a Scepter in his Hand, a Label of Gold on his Forehead; then take Blood and Perfumes, go into a Room which it was Death for any body to go into but himſelf, and for him, above once a Year, and then not without Blood and Incenſe: Blood to ſprinkle, to the Faces of two large Images, that ſtood upon a Cheſt whoſe Lid was of Gold, and then he was to burn the Perfumes, to make an agreeable Smell to the Noſes of the two Images; after this he was to return and bleſs the People; *the Lord make his Face to ſhine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee*, &c. a ſolemn Epilogue this after ſuch a Farce. Theſe, and too many other Particulars to be repeated here, unleſs they were underſtood, were but ſo many childiſh ridiculous Whims; a Farce which it ſhocks my Imagination to think, that God Almighty could ever enjoin, or be pleas'd with;

with; or People of the leaſt common Senſe ever attend to, without laughing. If they did not know the Meaning of their Law, in this, and no better View muſt they look on their Church Service; not being able to give the leaſt ſatisfactory Reaſon for any one of the Particulars above, and a Thouſand others.

But, if all this was to deſcribe the Death, Sufferings, and Benefits of the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, the Particulars of the one pointing out the Particulars of the other, it will then follow, that a future State was the Subject of *Moſes*'s Commiſſion and Inſtitutes, and from the Nature of the Thing, that the People muſt know it. The Law was *ſpiritual*, had the ὑποδείγμα, *Exemplar*, and was the *Shadow of heavenly Things*, of *the good Things to come*, was a *Figure for the Time then preſent*, Heb. ix. 9. Was *their* School-maſter to bring them unto *Chriſt*, Gal. iii. 24. It made Nothing perfect, but was ἐπεισάγωγη of *the better Hope:* It introduced the Hope of what could make perfect; as a School-maſter inſtructing them in the Knowledge of him who could give Perfection: and St. *Paul* gives a Reaſon why they *muſt* underſtand the Law, — "wherefore the Law was our School-maſter unto "*Chriſt*, that we *might be juſtified by Faith*, Gal. iii. 24. Theſe Texts are poſitive, [and without

without going to the Law itſelf, where there is Evidence in every Verſe almoſt] prove that a future State was the Subject of *Moſes*'s Commiſſion, and that his *Inſtitutes* were to inſtruct them in the Doctrine, and the Way and Means to obtain Happineſs in it; and how obvious does it lye? *Chriſt* was both Prieſt and Sacrifice, ſo the Prieſt brought the Sacrifice to the Altar, killed it there, ſubmitting to Death voluntarily: ſhed the Blood at the Foot of the Altar, as *Chriſt*'s was at the Foot of the Croſs. The Tabernacle, Altar, Prieſt and People, were all ſprinkled with Blood, ſo all waſhed clean by it, as *Chriſt*, who was the Temple, Altar and Prieſt, and (the People) his (myſtical) Body, are by his own Blood. We are Sons of him the Great High-prieſt, but all our Faculties muſt be rectified, the whole Man made clean, by his Blood; and then ſupported by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, the Unction or Anointing, which we have received of him; ſo their right Ear, *Obedience*; Thumb of the right Hand, *Actions*; and great Toe of the right Foot, *Ways*; were firſt touched with the Blood of the Sacrifice, and then with *Oil*; the Breaſt of the Sacrifice was *lifted up* to God, lifting up with it their Hearts and Affections to him: and the right Shoulder waved

waved or moved towards all Parts, to ſhew that his Obedience extended to, or was for the Benefit of all, and that all ſhould obey him: [*Shoulder* is *Conſent*, joint Action.] The Fat was to be taken off the Inwards and burnt, and ſo the Luſts and Paſſions burnt up, *&c.* The *whole* is carried out and burnt, as *Chriſt* was; and without the City Gate, as He was to be. He returned to the Church of God, was new cloathed in an immortal, glorious and ſpiritual Body; thence forward commenced King, and enter'd on his interceſſorial Office, aſcended into Heaven, [into which it is eternal Death for any to think of entering but through him] with his own Blood, which he exhibits to God for us; and with *Incenſe* his Merits; the ſweet Odor of which appeaſes the Wrath of God; and from thence is to return, as the *Levitical* Prieſt did from the Holy of Holies, to bleſs his People. Many Particulars of the higheſt Importance appear here at firſt View, and where is the Hurt in ſuppoſing People underſtood them? What Inconvenience would have followed? That the People had heard of a future State you have demonſtrably proved; but how they came by the Knowledge of it, or rather how the Knowledge of this, and the other Articles of Religion, [which the whole

whole Church of God was acquainted with] was kept up, you have not conſider'd; ſome *Form*, ſome *Eſtabliſhment* of Religion, there muſt be to keep up the *Spirit* of it: That there was no other than the *Moſaic*, the Law or Types, I believe will not be diſputed. The Prieſts, at ſtated Times, offered the Sacrifices of the People, and they had Places to meet in at thoſe Times for *Prayers*, and doubtleſs for *Inſtruction*. There is frequent Mention of the Prieſts being their *Teachers*, and of the People's *praying* in the Tabernacle and Temple; and without doubt, at the publick Times of Meeting, they explained to thoſe who ſtood in Need of it, what was intended by the Types; and *urg'd* to the People the Motives, which ariſe from thence, to Faith, Hope, and Love; and there *appears* no Reaſon to imagine, that the Types were not in the general as well underſtood, as Water in Baptiſm, and Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, are now: To them who ſaw the whole Proceſs, and that ſo often over, there could not be ſo much Obſcurity as ſome are apt to dream of. Their natural Capacities were as good then as ours are now, and take the whole of the Time the Church ſtood on Types and Ceremonies, their Zeal for Religion, and their Diſpoſition, appear to have

have been as good, as ever People's have been ſince; and tho' ſome truſted to the Law for Righteouſneſs, when *Chriſt* came, yet others did not, but waited for the Conſolation of *Iſrael*.

You run yourſelf into the ſame Sort of Contradiction I have before taken Notice of, when you allow, (as you occaſionally do) that the Law was *ſpiritual*, that the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, or, as you are pleaſed to word it, the *Goſpel-State* in *many* of its *Appointments*, was *prefigured*, *foreſhewn*, *predicted*, and the like; which are relative Terms, and ſuppoſe there were ſome People to whom it was *ſhewn before*, to whom it was *figured before*, and *told to*; *foreſhewing* muſt ſignify this; or what doth it ſignify? And do not you talk in the ſame Manner, without knowing what you mean, when you ſay, the *Evangelical* Covenant ſubſiſted together with the legal Diſpenſation, if they did not know what the *Evangelical* Covenant was? *Abraham*, and the People under the old Diſpenſation, knew a Redeemer was to come; you ſay, to redeem them: from what? or how? Did they mean by *Redemption* what we mean by it; or did not they know what it meant? Yes, ſay you, "They looked for *all the Benefits* of "God the Father, through the Merits of "his

" his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, as we now do (*i*)." They knew then that *Jeſus Chriſt* was to redeem them from the Power of Sin, *Satan* and Death. They muſt know alſo what his *Merits* were, or they could not *look* for all the Benefits of God the Father through thoſe Merits. Thus, Sir, according to yourſelf they did know that *Chriſt* was to die for them, to reſcue their Bodies from the Hand of Death, and their Souls from the Power of Sin and *Satan*; for theſe are the Benefits of God the Father to us, through the Merits of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

What a Pack of inſipid Fools do you make of the ancient Patriarchs and Prophets?—Men that cared neither for this World nor the next: Some People ſeem to have dream'd ſo long of their Religion being a Shadow, that they make Shadows of the very Men. What Idiots, when they knew that all the Benefits of God were to be derived to them, through the Merits of *Chriſt*, and yet to expect to be cleanſed from their Sins by the Blood of Bulls and of Goats! And how lovingly do the two Covenants they were under agree? the *Evangelical* taught them to aſpire after Glory and Immortality; the *temporal* Covenant of *itſelf* taught them, that earthly Things were the

(*i*) Exam. Page 104.

firſt and immediate Concern of Providence on their Behalf. One directs their Eyes to Heaven, the other fixes them on the Earth. There are two Salvo's that ſeem deſigned to evade the Abſurdities and Contradictions I have now fixed on you: Firſt, That to *prefigure* and *inform* are different Things: This Tranſaction, [*viz.* the Sacrifice of *Iſaac*] "*might prefigure*, and does *prefigure* the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, whether *Abraham* knew "any thing about the Sacrifice of *Chriſt* or "not. For it does not follow, that becauſe "a Thing is *prefigured*; therefore it muſt "be ſeen or underſtood, *at the Time* when "it is *prefigured* (*k*)." You argue in the ſame Strain, Page 156, 157. But, Sir, the Apoſtle, as well as common Senſe, and the common Acceptation of the Words, is point blank againſt you. He ſays, *Heb.* ix. 7—9. ſpeaking of the Atonement for Sins made by Blood under the Law, that it was *a Figure for the Time then preſent*; and therefore it does follow, that becauſe it was *prefigured*, that therefore it was ſeen and underſtood: What is true of the Blood of the Ram afterwards offered by *Abraham*, is true likewiſe of the Blood of *Iſaac*, that is, if the Blood of the Ram was a *Figure for the Time then preſent* of the Blood of *Chriſt*: The Blood of *Iſaac* muſt

(*k*) Exam. Page 150.

alſo

alſo have been *a Figure* (in the ſame View) *to the Time then preſent:* for the one was in Exchange for the other.

Secondly, That the ſimple Doctrine of a future State was the very Eſſence of the Covenant of Redemption (*l*), " the ſingle Point " of Knowledge that could be the Founda- " tion of a reaſonable Worſhip (*m*);" the Hope of the Goſpel; and Page 104, as a Comment on the ſeventh Article, " the " Myſtery of the Goſpel;" as if the Knowledge of a future State was all that the Article meant, by their looking for *all the Benefits of God through the Merits of* Chriſt, and that this was all they could learn from the Evangelical Covenant with *Adam*, that *a Seed of the Woman ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head*, which Page 24, you allow contained " a Promiſe of " the Deliverance of Mankind from the Curſe " denounced upon the Fall." But, Sir, it is ſtrange Divinity to make the Knowledge of a future State the *ſingle Point of Knowledge*, that could be the Foundation of a reaſonable Worſhip, or to call it the Eſſence of the Covenant of Redemption, the Hope or Myſtery of the Goſpel. *Chriſt* only is the Hope of Glory, [*Col.* i. 27. and 1 *Tim.* i. 1.] and Redemption through his Blood the *Eſſence* of the Covenant of Grace; the Knowledge of

(*l*) Exam. Page 34. (*m*) Page 131.

which

which only can teach that Faith which is effectual to Salvation; and the Myſtery of the Goſpel—" God manifeſt in the Fleſh, juſti-
" fied in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preach'd
" unto the *Gentiles*, believed on in the
" World, received up into Glory. 1 *Tim.*
" iii. 16." This is the Myſtery of Faith, of the Goſpel, of Godlineſs, which was *manifeſted* when *Chriſt* took Fleſh. If the bare Knowledge of a future State be the ſingle Point of Knowledge, that could be the Foundation of a reaſonable Worſhip, the Acknowledgment of the Atonement made by the Blood of *Chriſt* is not neceſſary to Salvation, *we* may perform a reaſonable Worſhip without it: I ſay, *we*, for if *they* could, why may not we *now?* And why do not *Mahometans*, *Jews*, and *Pagans* do the ſame, ſince they all know, and believe a future State? You have expreſſed yourſelf ſo often to the Purpoſe above, that it could hardly be accidental; or what you can be ſuppoſed not to have conſider'd; I hope you will find Time to reconſider it. Pray let me aſk, why the Knowledge of the Death of *Chriſt*, and conſequently Faith in him, can be ſuppoſed neceſſary to us, as an Atonement for the Sin entailed on us by the Fall; if ſuch Knowledge was not neceſſary to him who brought that

Sin upon us? And if *Adam* was acquainted with this Doctrine, as being the Eſſence of the Covenant of Redemption, I may ſuppoſe as you do, Page 24, with Regard to the Knowledge of a future State, that the Knowledge of the Death and Sacrifice of the Redeemer, as being of equal Intereſt to all Mankind, was handed down by an uninterrupted Tradition from *Adam*, and propagated by his Poſterity wherever they ſettled. Whatever Knowledge they might have, they could have no Hopes of future Happineſs, but thro' his Merits and Atonement, and this they were told poſitively by theſe emblematical, figurative or metaphorical Expreſſions, that *the Seed of the Woman ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head*, and that *the Serpent ſhould bruiſe his Heel*. What is couch'd under theſe Expreſſions could be the only Foundation of their Hopes; and why are they ſuppoſed ignorant of the Meaning of them, ſince they had thoſe Hopes whoſe only Foundation are the Articles of Faith they contain. By the Care that has been taken to preſerve the outward Figure, they muſt formerly univerſally know the Meaning and Importance of it; we find it ſtill preſerved in their Hieroglyphics, even in the diſtant Parts of *China*; where in the Image of their God, which is a Man with a

hundred Hands, holding Air, Earth, and Water, and all their Products; you may ſee among other Things one Hand ſtriking at the Head of a Serpent, which is biting at his Heel. Here we ſee at firſt View, the Tradition that God ſhould take Fleſh, that all Power in Heaven and Earth ſhould be put into his Hands, that his Heel ſhould be bruiſed, and at the ſame Time, that he ſhould bruiſe the Head of the Enemy. Give me Leave to mention another of their ancient hieroglyphical Figures; it is a Man without Feet, between two Altars, one burning with Wood upon it, the other with Incenſe; on one Side of him ſtands a Stag, on the other a Bird of that Species, which in *Hebrew* is called חסידה, *Mercy* or *Commiſeration*, ſuffering with or for others. The Man, or God in Humanity *lamed*, or without Feet, is juſt what the Word for the *Paſſover* ſignifies, and as the Ancients painted the Vengeance of God; the two Altars are the Fire which conſumed the Sacrifice, or *the Wrath of God*; and the Incenſe, which repreſented that *Wrath appeaſed*, as the Bird before mention'd, I ſuppoſe was deſign'd likewiſe to point out; and then the Stag was inſtead of the Ram. So here was the *Paſſover* drawn in Hieroglyphics; and one would imagine they knew

what they meant by their own Pictures. But to return, If any think *Adam* did not know what God meant by thoſe Expreſſions, I hope they will give us their Reaſons. In Conſequence of this ſuppoſed Ignorance in Patriarchs, Prophets, and the whole Church of God, of the *true and only* Means of Salvation, you are at a Loſs, or do not Care to take upon you to ſay, whether *David* himſelf knew his own Body was to riſe again; " Whether *David* underſtood that his Bo-" dy was to ariſe after Death, I do not " take upon me to determine at preſent(*n*)," and " the high, ſublime, ſpiritual Meaning " in theſe Paſſages [out of the Pſalms, the " 16th among others] can be no other than " what I am contending for, the Doctrine " of a future State (*o*)." St. *Peter* ſays that *David, ſeeing* the Reſurrection of *Chriſt before*, ſpake the 16th Pſalm of it [*Acts* ii. 31.] If *David ſaw* the Reſurrection beforehand, he muſt alſo know of the Death of *Chriſt*; and the high, ſublime, ſpiritual, [and let me add *grammatical, literal*] Meaning of thoſe Paſſages out of the ſixteenth Pſalm, muſt be ſomething more than what you are contending for, *viz.* what St. *Peter* makes it—*Chriſt's being looſed from the Bond of Death, and ex-*

(*n*) Exam. Page 49. (*o*) Page 50.

alted

alted to the right Hand of God: And if *David* knew this, as St. *Peter* ſays *he ſaw it before*, you may, Sir, at any Time determine whether *David* knew his own Body was to riſe again. Whether ſuch Aſſertions as ſhut out the whole Church of God from that *ſingle Point* of Knowledge, which could be the Foundation of a reaſonable Worſhip, be not a Diſgrace to Revelation, I muſt aſk ſomebody elſe, Dr. *Stebbing* is not at Leiſure, it ſeems, to be troubled with ſuch impertinent Queſtions: I may add further, that the Doctor makes God by his own Act, and Authority, juſtify the *Jews* in expecting Salvation from the Law; for in it he tells them over and over again, that the *Blood* and *Oil* were to *atone* for their Sins and *ſanctify* them; therefore, it turned their Eyes from the promiſed Redeemer to Bulls and Calves, and taught them to *expect* Life from the *carnal Ordinances*; for truſting to which, they were at laſt entirely deſtroyed from being a Nation. So the Fathers went to Heaven for believing that for which *Chriſt* ſends the Sons to Hell.

It appears by the Promiſes to *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, that the Redemption of the World by *Jeſus Chriſt* was a known Doctrine; but theſe Promiſes were not the Covenant; they ſuppoſe ſuch a Covenant in being,

(as in fact it was, by what was ſaid to *Noah*, on his offering a Type of *Chriſt*, when he came out of the Ark) becauſe they only promiſe, that the Perſon who was to redeem us ſhould deſcend from their Loins; they entail the high Honour of *Chriſt*'s Birth on their Family. The Covenant of Redemption was made before the World, "the Grace of God "was given us in *Chriſt Jeſus* before the "World began, [2 *Tim.* i. 9.]" and was revealed to *Adam* on his Fall, as appears from thoſe Words juſt cited, that *the Seed of the Woman ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head, and it ſhould bruiſe his Heel.* It cannot be ſuppoſed that *Adam* did not know what God meant. The Death then of *Chriſt* as our Sacrifice, was as old as *Adam*, as being the *very Eſſence* of the Covenant of Redemption, and of *equal Intereſt* to all Mankind; and accordingly we find Sacrifices, as the *outward* Profeſſion of their Religion, and Figures of the *Lamb who was ſlain from the Foundation of the World*, to have been in Uſe from the firſt: and there is *ſcarce* a Ceremony in the *Moſaic* Law, but what we find to have been in Uſe before. And this, Sir, anſwers the Objection, which you cite p. 35, if it wants anſwering, that *the Law of* Moſes *forbids the leaſt Addition to the written Inſtitutes.* The

Doctrines

Doctrines of Redemption by the Blood of *Chriſt*, Pardon of Sins, imputed Righteouſneſs, and a future State of Rewards and Puniſhments, were no Addition to the written Inſtitutes, but the Senſe and Meaning of them.

You aſk, " What had *Moſes* to do as to " the ſpiritual Covenant?" p. 36. I anſwer, to renew, reinſtitute, and record in Writing that Syſtem of Rites and Ceremonies, which at the Time of the firſt Promiſe of a Redeemer to *Adam*, was appointed the outward viſible Signs, Exemplars, and Figures of the good Things to come. Doubtleſs, in ſuch a Number of Years, as from the Fall to *Moſes*, ſeveral Errors had crept in, and ſeveral Alterations of the original Plan taken place; and it pleaſed God to make ſome few others now, the better to anſwer the general Deſign, ſuch as limiting the Prieſthood to one Branch of one Family, *&c.* But the Church Service from *Adam* to *Chriſt* was for Sum and Subſtance the ſame; as you may ſee at large in Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Writings, if you pleaſe to give yourſelf the Trouble. I have endeavoured to epitomiſe the Argument, in my Anſwer to *W——n* on this Subject, before you favour'd us with yours.

You ſay, *Chriſt* came to *explain the ſpiritual Covenant more perfectly*, and that the

full Manifeſtation of it was reſerved for him. Had no more been revealed about it than what is expreſſed in the Promiſe to *Abraham*, it would have wanted a pretty deal of explaining; and though Mankind would not have been quite ſo much in the Dark about the Notion of a future State, they would have been as much at a Loſs for the Means to qualify themſelves for it, and almoſt as ignorant of him, who was to purge their Conſciences from dead Works to ſerve the living God, as if nothing had been ſaid about him. The revealing a future State of Rewards and Puniſhments to them, muſt only have tended to perplex and torment them, unleſs the Prince of Life had been revealed to them likewiſe, whoſe Righteouſneſs *only* could be the Ground of their Hope of an happy Immortality; and whoſe Righteouſneſs they could not be acquainted with, without being acquainted with his Death and Sufferings: But be pleaſed, Sir, to give me leave to ask, Where *Chriſt* has *explained any Thing more perfectly?* What Points of Faith he has more fully revealed; or what Duty of Morality is carried to a higher Pitch, than the Law carries it? He came *to do* the Will of God, *to fulfil* the Law; " *to fulfil* all " all Things that were written in the Law " of

" of *Moſes*, and in the Prophets, and in the " Pſalms concerning him — that it behoved " *Chriſt* to ſuffer, and to riſe from the " Dead the third Day, and that Repentance " and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be preached " in his Name, [*Luke* xxiv. 44—46.]" and accordingly St. *Paul*, who ſays, *Acts* xx. 27. *He had declared all the Counſel of God*, yet afterwards, Chap. xxvi. 22. ſays, *He had declared no other Things, than what the Prophets and* Moſes *did ſay, ſhould come, that* Chriſt *ſhould ſuffer, that he ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the Dead, and ſhould ſhew Light to the People and to the* Gentiles. There is nothing in what is called the *Abrahamic* Covenant [and which is ſplit into two, and without any Manner of Reaſon diſtinguiſhed from the Covenant of *Horeb*, or from the Law as a ſpiritual Covenant in Oppoſition to a temporal one] there is nothing, I ſay, in this Covenant with *Abraham*, *expreſſed* about *Chriſt's* Death or Reſurrection, which the Texts above ſay *Moſes* has [ſome how] expreſſed; much leſs *all* that the Apoſtles preached; and yet theſe and many other Texts do ſay, that *Moſes* and the Prophets had predicted and deſcribed all that was to be fulfilled; and conſequently *Chriſt* did not come to explain, reveal, or diſcover the Counſel of God concerning

cerning our Redemption, but to *perform*, *fulfil*, *manifeſt*, or carry it into Execution; and ſo you ſometimes expreſs yourſelf, without ſeeming to obſerve the wide Difference, and neceſſary Diſtinction to be made, between *Chriſt*'s diſcovering the Will of God, and fulfilling what was revealed before. And here ſeems to lye the Ground of that unhappy Miſtake, which ſome very great Men have fallen into with Regard to the Law and Goſpel; who out of Zeal to the Goſpel, ſuppoſe the Will of God, as to *Juſtification* and *Sanctification*, was not known from the Beginning —" that we have more Light and Know-" ledge than they had—that God has direct-" ed us to ſeek his Kingdom and his Righte-" ouſneſs, which it was not offenſive in " them to overlook (*p*), for they were under a temporal Covenant,—had ſome faint Glimmerings of *Chriſt*, ſome Knowledge of ſomething they knew not what or how, *ſome Degree of Light*, whatever it was; and ſay as you do, " What diſtinct Notions the Fa-" thers had of the Redemption promiſed " them, they do not know, that they un-" derſtood *all* of it that *Chriſt* has ſince *re-" vealed*, does not ſeem credible (*q*)." So he made a Promiſe to them, and they *ſaw* it,

(*p*) *See* Exam. Page 53 and 54. (*q*) Page 25.

were

were *perſuaded* of it, *embraced* it, but did not know what it was. To convince the Heirs of this Promiſe of the Immutability of his Counſel, God ſware by himſelf that he would redeem them; but they did not know what that Counſel was, the Immutability of which was of ſuch Conſequence to them; Thus do they talk, but don't tell us why the Fathers ſhould not have diſtinct Notions of the Redemption by *Chriſt*, or point out what *Chriſt revealed*. They muſt have a rational Ground for Hope; or there could be none for their Endeavours to pleaſe God. Hope is the Product of Faith, and Faith could not ſubſiſt without the Knowledge of *Chriſt*. And it is ſurpriſing that you, Sir, ſhould ſo often talk of their Hopes of Happineſs, and never once think what thoſe Hopes could be founded upon, how they thought their Sins were to be atoned for, or who was to appeaſe the Wrath of God, and pay the Forfeiture for them; but perhaps they knew as little of the Fall, and Curſe of the Fall; of the firſt *Adam*, as they did of the ſecond, and the Bleſſing in him. According to Scripture, the *juſt live by Faith*, they could not have Faith without Knowledge, and the Death *of Chriſt* as our Ranſom, our Surety, is the firſt Article of *Faith*, that

that on which all the reſt depends: This Knowledge they muſt have, or they could not have Faith in it; and without Faith they could not have Life; as one even of thoſe ignorant *Jews* tells us, *Hab.* ii. 4. in the Words juſt above. The Knowledge of *Chriſt*'s Death they *might have* had from the Types, and you ſeem almoſt to have forced yourſelf into a Concluſion that they had, p. 76, 77, where you cite from *Warburton*, "the Law had a "Shadow of the good Things to come," by which is meant, [ſays that wretchedeſt of all Reaſoners] "ſuch a typical Repreſentation "ſo faintly delineated as not to be perceived "by the People;" on which you remark, "So then it ſeems, the Doctrine of a fu-"ture State was ſo faintly exhibited *under* "the Law, that the People did not perceive "or know any thing about it." You ſhould have ſaid, Sir, *faintly delineated by the Law*, for that was what he ſaid, and the Text he blunders upon doth ſay; that the Law *had* the Shadow of the good Things to come, or that the good Things to come were ſhadowed out *by* the Law or Types: and then you correct him for ſaying, the good Things to come were ſo faintly exhibited or ſhadowed out *by* the Types, as not to be perceived by the People; and the Concluſion is, that in your

your Opinion, they were not ſo faintly exhibited or delineated, but that they *were* or *might* be perceived by the People, in which you ſay, what I am contending for, but in Contradiction to yourſelf, that " *Chriſt*'s being to be " offer'd to bear the Sins of many, and that " he ſhould appear the ſecond Time without " [a Sacrifice for] Sin, unto Salvation," was ſo ſhadowed out by the Law, as to be learnt from thence by the People; for thoſe are the Doctrines which St. *Paul* is ſpeaking of, [*Heb.* ix. 28, and x. 1.] when he ſays, " the " Law had the Shadow of the good Things " to come;" and then the *Moſaic* Covenant was as much ſpiritual as the *Abrahamic*, being one and the ſame. And here, Sir, give me leave to correct the Diſtinction you make p. 67, and which you ſay is a right one—*Sub Lege, ſed non ex Lege*; which you make in Oppoſition to their Learning the Knowledge of a future State *from* the Law or Types, " the Hopes of which, you ſay, they " had *by* the *Evangelical Covenant*, which " ſubſiſted *under* or together with the legal " Diſpenſation." Sir, they had *Life, future Happineſs, by* the Law, *Lev.* xviii. 5. Cited *Rom.* x. 5. " The Man which does thoſe " Things ſhall live by them." This could not be ſpoke of him who did not *underſtand*

 the,

the ſpiritual Senſe, and ſo, reſted on the *Letter* of the Law, as you make the whole Church of God to do; but of him who had Faith, and knew what he was doing, when he ſhed the Blood of Bulls and Goats, and offer'd it to God; and this proves againſt you, that they did underſtand the Law; that they learnt from their Types the Doctrines of Atonement through the Blood of *Chriſt*, Reconciliation to God in Virtue of this Blood, and in Conſequence of that, Sanctification by the Holy Spirit here, and eternal Happineſs hereafter; and your Diſtinction ſhould have been *per Legem, ſed non ex Lege:* for they had both the *Knowledge*, and a *Title* to *Life*, *by* the Law, but not *from* the Law. I am not, Sir, contending for Victory but Truth, and hope I ſhall keep clear from every thing which ought to give you Offence; but as you have referred me to the Publick, not being at Leiſure to debate theſe Matters in a private Way, you will excuſe, I hope, the Freedom I take, in examining what you have laid before the Publick. I ſincerely believe you to be what you profeſs yourſelf, — "a "Friend to Chriſtianity, and to all who are "able and willing to promote its Intereſts.(*r*)" But give me leave to borrow your own Words,

(*r*) Exam. Page 132.

and

and argue as you do; Sir, you are Debtor to the Publick, and I hope, that in the next Book, you will make ſome Amends, for the Wrong you have done to Religion in this; in which, inſtead of placing Chriſtianity upon a ſure Bottom, you have only furniſhed out Handles to Unbelievers: For what Notion will an Unbeliever be apt to entertain of Chriſtianity, when its grand Principles are made *arbitrary*, *unneceſſary* Truths; for you make the Atonement of *Chriſt*, and Faith in his Blood, not neceſſary to Salvation for above four Thouſand Years. Is God arbitrarily and without any Reaſon to juſtify the World for one half, perhaps, of its Duration, *by Works*, and reject the other for *adhering* to thoſe very Works? Shall *Abraham* and the Prophets become the Friends of God, on a Set of Principles, which are *now* condemn'd by himſelf, as inſufficient to Salvation, as being derogatory to his Glory, and making void the Righteouſneſs and Grace of God? You make void alſo the *Law of God* (by *Moſes*) through Ignorance, when you ſuppoſe it not underſtood in its true Deſign, and ſo its Uſe was to *hoodwink* all thoſe to whom it was vouchſafed, inſtead of enlightening them: It muſt *deceive*, if it did not *inform* them of the Truth. If there is any Hope worthy the

Attention

Attention of a ſinful Creature, it is the Hope of Pardon of his Sins through his Redeemer, without which he can have no *well-grounded* Hope of any thing better to come, when this vain troubleſome Life ſhall have an End. And here you condemn *Warburton*, for ſaying juſt what you have ſaid yourſelf— "You have told us [ſay you to *Warburton*] "that temporal Good and Evil were propoſed "and diſpenſed to them, to *confine* them to "the Hopes of this World—ſtrange and "till now unheard of Doctrine (*t*)." And yet, Sir, you tell us juſt the ſame yourſelf, ſtrange and unheard of as the Doctrine is; for you have told us, as we have already ſeen, that they were under the temporal Covenant, which *very Covenant* itſelf taught them temporal Things would be the *firſt immediate Concern of Providence on their Behalf*; and that its Rewards were *purely*, *only* temporal. But to proceed.

I have conſtrued the Text which you undertake to explain in the 76th and following Pages in a different Manner than our *Tranſlation* does, *viz.* that the Law *was* the Introduction of the better Hope; putting in *was*, inſtead of *did*, which I ſubmit to better Judgments.

(*t*) Exam. Page 133.

Pages

Pages the ſeventieth and following, you have under Conſideration, 2 *Tim.* i. 10, " brought Life and Immortality to Light " through the Goſpel," which you make *revealing the Doctrine* of a Reſurrection and future Happineſs to the Heathen World; who, indeed, were very ignorant of theſe, and the other Articles of Religion. I think there is no Diſpute, but that the *Gentiles* are the Perſons *ſitting in Darkneſs, and the Shadow of Death*, Iſa. ix. and the *Gentiles*, ſay you, *only*, are the Perſons to whom Life is brought to Light, the *Jews* being then in Poſſeſſion of the Doctrine of Life and Incorruption. To confirm your Sentiment, you ſay, " *Chriſt* is ſaid to be a Light to the " *Gentiles*; but you do not remember any " Paſſage in which *Chriſt* is characterized " as a Light to the *Jews* (*t*)"; I am perſuaded, Sir, you cannot produce *one* " plain " Paſſage in Scripture, where the *Jews* " as the People of God are ſet forth as ſitting in Darkneſs, and the Shadow of " Death." *Jehovah* is very often ſaid to be a *Light* to the *Jews*, as is eaſily ſeen by a Concordance, *Iſ.* ii. 5. " O Houſe of *Jacob*, " come ye, and let us walk in the *Light of* " the Lord." *Iſai.* xxxi. 9. Whoſe *Light* is

(*t*) Exam. Page 74, and 75.

" in *Zion*." *Pſal.* xxvii. 1. *Jehovah* is my " *Light*." *Pſal.* xxxvi. 10. In thy *Light* " ſhall we ſee the *Light*." *Pſal.* xliii. 3. " Send " out thy *Light* and thy Truth." *Pſal.* cxviii. 27. " God is the Lord which has ſhewed us " *Light*." Theſe Paſſages, and fifty others, characterize *Chriſt* as a *Light* to the *Jews*. And *Iſ.* lix. 9. we waited for *Light*, but behold Obſcurity; for " Brightneſs, *but we walk in Dark-* " *neſs*," is one *plain Paſſage*, where the *Jews*, the People of God, are ſet forth as in Darkneſs, and the Shadow of Death. *Michah* vii. 8. is another, " when I ſit in Darkneſs, the Lord " ſhall be a *Light* unto me — he will bring " me forth to the *Light*, and I ſhall behold " his Righteouſneſs." Others, not a few, may be produced to the ſame Purpoſe.

But why, Sir, muſt *bringing Life and Immortality to Light* be bringing the Doctrine to Knowledge? Light does ſignify Knowledge, and it alſo ſignifies *Life* and *Happineſs*. The People that ſat in Darkneſs, *may* be thoſe who were under the *Power* and *Dominion* of Death and Miſery; To theſe, *i. e.* to all Mankind, did *Chriſt*, who *lighteth every Man that cometh into the World*, ariſe with Healing in his Wings, and give Life and Happineſs: for he is the Life and Light of Men, *John* i. 4. And ſo St. *Paul* ſays, as cited above,

bove, " that *Chriſt* ſhould riſe from the " Dead, and *ſhew Light* to the *People* [*viz.* " of the *Jews*] and to the *Gentiles*," *Acts* xxvi. 22. which I apprehend means more than inſtructing them in the Knowledge of a future State; here St. *Paul* ſays *Chriſt* was to *ſhew Light* to the *Jews*, therefore *bringing Life to Light* cannot mean *the more open, or publick Manifeſtation of what was known*, either *imperfectly*, *or but to a few*; ſince he is ſaid to *ſhew Light* to thoſe very *few*, who were well acquainted with the Doctrine of Life and Immortality. Put the firſt Part of the Verſe and the latter together, *i. e.* only remember what is ſaid in the Beginning, when you are conſidering the End of the Verſe, and the Apoſtle's Meaning is very plain, that *Chriſt* has, by what he did during his appearing on Earth, actually manifeſted that Grace, Mercy, or Favour, which was given us, in him, before the World began, hath now aboliſhed Death, and hath given us a *Sight*, Demonſtration of Life and Immortality by his own Reſurrection, " Saved " us, according to his own Purpoſe and " Grace, which was given us in *Chriſt Jeſus* " before the World began; but is now made " manifeſt by the Appearing of our Saviour " *Jeſus Chriſt*, who has aboliſhed Death

and φωτίσαν]ος, *illuminated* [brought to the Light] *Life and Incorruption*; or an immortal incorruptible State. The Grace was manifeſted by his aboliſhing Death, and bringing *Immortality* to the Light, by what he *did*, not by what he *preached*: He *aboliſhed* Death when he broke the Bands of Death, and by riſing again made it viſible that there was to be a Reſurrection, was preached before the Flood, known to *Noah* and his Children, and was the Belief of the Church of God from the firſt to the laſt; and perhaps was known to, and believed by as many, reckoning from the firſt, till our Saviour came, as it has been by ſince. Their Hieroglyphics, *inter alia*, the Sun within their Monuments, and the Lyon [Light] on the Outſide, ſhews that till low down even the Heathen World had retained the Knowledge of the Promiſe of new Light, new Life to the Dead. But you give it as a Reaſon that it was to the *Gentiles*, and not to the *Jews*, that Life and Incorruption were brought to the Light, becauſe the Apoſtle inſtantly ſubjoins, "whereunto *i. e.* to which Work of bring-
"ing Life and Immortality to Light, I am
"appointed a Preacher, and an Apoſtle, and
"a Teacher of the *Gentiles* (*u*)." Accord-

(*u*) Exam. Page 74.

ing

ing to you, Sir, it was not *Chriſt*, but the Apoſtles who aboliſhed Death, and brought Life to Light, for it was *they* and not *he* who preached to the *Gentiles*. Beſides, you make the Apoſtle ſay, " *Chriſt* has *diſcovered* to " the *Jews* [for to them only he preached] " the Knowledge of a Reſurrection, which " they had before, to which Work of Teach- " ing I am appointed a Teacher." The Doctor did not remember that *Chriſt* taught none but the *Jews*, and that if he did diſcover the Doctrine, it muſt be to them, ſince he preached only to them; nor obſerve, that being appointed a Teacher to the Work of Teaching, is a *Warburtonian* Flower, in plain Engliſh Nonſenſe.

The unaccountable Whim of making no Difference betwixt Teaching the Doctrine of a Reſurrection, and *deſtroying Death*, betwixt the Promiſe of the Atonement by *Chriſt* under the Law, and *Chriſt*'s making that Atonement under the Goſpel, runs them on Contradictions to common Senſe, to themſelves, to Scripture, to the Faith. I could point out, were it neceſſary to the Argument I have in View, a great Number more of ſuch Contradictions in Dr. *Stebbing*; but it is not neceſſary, nor an agreeable Taſk to me; nor have I done what I have, with any other

View, than as I think it neceſſary to the illuſtrating this great Truth, that Jews and Chriſtians were both *Believers* alike. That the ſame Faith was always *neceſſary*, was always *propoſed* to Mankind, and never confined to a Corner, or made neceſſary for one when it was not for another; which are the Objections Deiſts, Atheiſts, and ſuch Fry triumph upon; and to ſupport which a Bundle of Common Place Stuff was lately publiſhed under the Title of—*The divine Legation of Moſes de—nied.*

I ſhall now cite ſome Paſſages out of your Appendix and Hiſtory of *Abraham*, where you ſeem to me to have miſtaken the Nature of *Abraham*'s Trial, and the *Evidence* of the *Types*.

The Command to *Abraham* to ſacrifice *Iſaac* you make a Trial of his Patience.—"That he might be a Pattern of patient "ſuffering, even unto the End (*y*) of his "Virtue, *i. e.* of his Patience and Self-de-"nial.——This Command was intended "as a Trial, *p.* 163. "It doth not ap-"pear how *Abraham* could collect from "this Tranſaction, that *Chriſt* was to be of-"fered up as a Sacrifice (*z*)." "You will "not pretend, I ſuppoſe, that by any com-

(*y*) Exam. Page 153. (*z*) Ibid.

mon

" mon Uſage of thoſe Times, this Tranſac-
" tion was *ſignificative* of the Sacrifice of
" *Chriſt* (*a*)."—There may be Reaſons why
" an obſcure Revelation may be recorded;
" to wit, for the Inſtruction of future Ages,
" when the Obſcurity being cleared up by
" the Event, it ſhall appear it was *foreſeen*
" and foreordained in the Knowledge and Ap-
" pointment of God. — The Tranſaction in
" queſtion will have the ſame Efficacy to ſhew
" the Dependency between the two Diſpen-
" ſations, whether *Abraham* had thereby any
" Information of the Sacrifice of *Chriſt* or
" not (*b*)." " *Iſaac*—was demanded of his
" Father to be offered up as a Sacrifice, as an
" Acknowledgment of God's *Sovereign Do-*
" *minion* over all his Creatures (*c*)." " In
" the Caſe of *Abraham*'s offering up his Son,
" (ſuppoſing it to have been a Type of the
" Sacrifice of *Chriſt*) the Information con-
" veyed by it to thoſe under the Old Te-
" ſtament (if any was conveyed) *could* only
" have been this, that *Chriſt* ſhould be offer-
" ed up as a Sacrifice for the Sins of the
" World; and to thoſe under the New Te-
" ſtament it muſt be this, that from the Days
" of *Abraham* it had been *foreappointed* or

(*a*) Exam. Pag. 154. (*b*) Pag. 156. (*c*) Hiſt. Pag. 42.

" *foreordained* of God. It is with this laſt " kind of Information that we are concerned " at preſent."

All then that the Types are to prove, is, that God had *foreappointed* or *foreordained* ſo and ſo; and how are we to prove that God did *intend* that ſuch a *Type*, that of *Iſaac*, for inſtance, and the Ram offered in his ſtead, ſhould *foreſhew* to thoſe to whom it ſhewed nothing of the Death of *Chriſt*, that *Chriſt* was to die as a Sacrifice; why there is no Bible Proof to be had: To prove it from the New Teſtament, that is (*d*) againſt all the Rules of Reaſoning in the World, and as for the Old Teſtament, it is wholly ſilent on the Head, " There is no ſuch Bible Proof to be " found—in the Nature of the Thing no ſuch " Proof there could be (*e*)." " The *only* " Way of aſcertaining the Senſe of the ancient " Types, ſo as to make them Evidences to " Unbelievers, is the comparing Tranſactions " with Events, and obſerving the Similitude " and Correſpondency between them (*f*)."

The Strength or Force of this Evidence ariſes to—*only a Probability* that God did *intend* it. " It yields a *ſtrong Probability* that " this did not happen by Chance.—I call this

(*d*) Exam. Pag. 61. (*e*) Pag. 63. (*f*) Pag. 64.

" a ſtrong Probability. I go no farther (*g*)."
" Theſe and all other Types of like ſort ſpeak
" to *us only* who live under this laſt Diſpenſa-
" tion, for whoſe Inſtruction *alone* they were
" intended." " *Abraham* could not collect,
" merely from his being commanded to ſacri-
" fice his Son, that *Chriſt* was to be ſacrificed;
" nor could the *Jews* collect it from the Sa-
" crifice of the Lamb (*h*)."

The Ground of all this falſe Reaſoning has been laid open already; and I hope fully made appear to the Satisfaction of every impartial Perſon.

If Mankind were acquainted, at the firſt, with the Conſequence of the Fall, (as I believe nobody will deny *Adam* was) that Sin had brought Death temporal and eternal upon them, ſubjecting them to the Wrath of God, which it was impoſſible for Man by his own Merits to appeaſe, it muſt follow that they knew they could expect no Happineſs till *Somebody elſe* ſhould pay the Debt they had incurred, and ſatisfy the divine Juſtice, which they themſelves could not do.

If Mankind were acquainted (as nobody will deny *Adam* was) that a Seed of a Woman was to be their Surety, and ſuffer what Man deſerved, and ſo pay his Ranſom, and

(*g*) Exam. Pag. 65. and 66. (*h*) Pag. 67.

buy

buy him out of the Hand of divine Juſtice, and of Death, by undergoing Death (the Penalty of his Sin) in his ſtead; in ſhort, if People knew at the firſt, that they died in *Adam*, and were to be made alive again in *Chriſt*, as *Moſes* tells us they were informed, then it follows that they muſt know no other Sacrifice could be accepted as the Atonement for Sin; and by neceſſary Conſequence, that no other Sacrifice had any Virtue in it, but what the Faith of the Sacrificer derived to him from the expected Sacrifice of *Chriſt*. The Alternative muſt be true, either that they *truſted only* in the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, or that they knew nothing of it. They did know that it was the Redeemer, the Seed of the Woman, who was to bruiſe the Serpent's Head, or which is the ſame thing, procure Pardon for their Sins, and reſtore to them the forfeited Immortality, therefore they *truſted only* in *Chriſt*. The Blood of the Lamb, *e. g.* offered by *Abel* could not atone for his Sin; he knew a Redeemer was to come, and therefore did not expect to be cleanſed from his Sin by the Blood of the Brute, and yet he believed (for St. *Paul* informs us, *Heb.* xi. 4, 28. that he ſacrificed with the ſame Deſign that *Moſes* did) that if he ſacrificed the Lamb, his Sin would be forgiven him: Therefore he knew that

that the Blood of the Lamb was only ſacramental, typical, and deſcriptive of his Blood who could really cleanſe from Sin.

The Argument ſtands thus. They knew they had forfeited Life; they knew they could not be reſtored to it but by the promiſed Redeemer, who was to bruiſe him who had the Power of Death, therefore knew that Sacrifices were but the Sacrament, Type and Figure; and that the Eye of Faith muſt bring to Sight, what the Eye of Senſe could not, him who was then at a diſtance. Hence *Abraham* needed no *ſpecial Intimation* what he was bid to offer up his Son for. He knew before that *Chriſt* was to die for him, that Sacrifices were the ſtanding Type and Evidence of it, he knew therefore that no Sacrifice whatever could have any Virtue in it, but as it referred to the great Original; or any other Deſign but as a Proof of the Faith of him who offered it, by which he did acknowledge that he deſerved Death, and that another was to undergo it for him, *viz.* He whoſe Heel was to be bruiſed when he ſhould bruiſe the Serpent's Head.

It is true that *Abraham could not collect, merely from his being commanded to ſacrifice his Son, that Chriſt was to be ſacrificed; nor could the Jews collect it from the Sacrifice of*

the Lamb. But the Inference is not true that *Abraham* and the *Jews* did not therefore know that the Sacrifice of *Iſaac* and of the Lamb was but a Type or Figure of the Death of *Chriſt*, for they knew that every Sacrifice was nothing elſe. Had *Abraham* been unacquainted with the Death of *Chriſt*, and never known or ſuſpected any thing of it, or had he never offered any Sacrifice before, I believe he would have ſtood and ſtared at the Command to offer up his Son, as much as Infidels do now, and have argued as nonſenſically about it. He had been uſed to Sacrifice before, we find it ſeveral times mentioned, that he built an Altar to *Jehovah*, wherever he ſojourned: The Altar muſt be to ſacrifice upon; and whatever Deſign he had ſacrificed with before, he would, of courſe, underſtand he was to offer up his Son with, only his Son was to be looked on as a more precious and valuable Gift; the Deſign he built his Altars for was *to invoke the Name Jehovah*, Gen. xii. 8. that Name, thro' Faith, in whom he was to be made whole. *Abraham* lived in a corrupted Age, when Chriſtianity was the Jeſt of the many; and few or none but himſelf and his own Family adhered to the Worſhip of the God who had ſworn to redeem Man. He believed a Saviour was to come, and knew the

he was to aboliſh Death by undergoing Death; as he was informed by the Types then in Uſe, by the Cherubim, and doubtleſs by Tradition: So he needed no *ſpecial Intimation*, tho' he left one for others, when he recorded in the Name he gave the Mountain, that *Jehovah* ſhould be ſeen on it; as in fact he was when *Chriſt* died there, as the Sacrifice of all Mankind. God Almighty in this Command to *Abraham* ſeems to ſpeak this Language.—" I have determined " to give up my Son, my only Son, as a Sacri- " fice for the World; and as from thy Son, " that Son of mine is to deſcend, offer him " up, as the propereſt and neareſt Reſemblance " of the great Sacrifice; and your Conqueſt " over natural Affection, and giving up your " Son, will be the ſtrongeſt and moſt affect- " ing Conviction of your *Belief* of my Pur- " poſe to thoſe who doubt or diſpute it; by " your Submiſſion they will ſee your Faith, " and what ought to be their own. And " here all Parents may judge of the Great- " neſs of my Mercy and Love to them, " by feeling what it is to give up a Child, " an only Child." Thus was it *by Faith, Abraham*, when he *was tried*, offered up *Iſaac*; he was ſo firmly convinced that *Chriſt* was to die for him, and that no other Sacrifice could avail him any thing; that he ſcrupled not to give Proof of his Faith, tho'

at

at the Expence of ſo great and ſo dear a Pledge. And here alſo was room for that Struggle which St. *Paul* makes *Abraham* have within himſelf, *Heb.* xi. 17. " He that had " received the Promiſes, offered up his only " begotten Son: of whom it was ſaid, that " in *Iſaac* ſhall thy Seed be called, account- " ing that God was able to raiſe him up even " from the Dead." *Abraham* ſeems to have reaſoned thus:—" I know that the Son of " God is to come and die for me, and I am " informed by God himſelf, that he is at " preſent in the Loins of my Son *Iſaac*, whom " I am now bid to offer up as a Type or Fi- " gure of that Sacrifice which only can atone " or be pleaſing in his Sight: How are theſe " two Promiſes conſiſtent? Is *Chriſt* to die " for me, and to deſcend from *Iſaac* whom " I am commanded to kill? It may be ſo, I " know the Redeemer is to come, and God " can raiſe up *Iſaac* from the Dead; I will " give the commanded Proof of my Faith, " and leave the Event to his Wiſdom." Pray let me aſk, that unleſs *Abraham* offered up his Son as a Type of *Chriſt*, where was his *Faith? Faith* refers to *Chriſt*. It was the Chriſtian Faith, ſays our Church in the Homily Book, (as cited by yourſelf, *p.* 104, and by Mr. *Romaine* and myſelf in this Diſpute long

long ago) which St. *Paul* ſpeaks of in this Chapter, or a *Faith* by which they looked for *all the Benefits of God the Father thro' the Merits of his Son Jeſus Chriſt*; and if *Abraham* knew nothing of his Death, or Merits, how was it by Faith he offered up *Iſaac?* Could he have Faith in that which he knew nothing of? This Command then was not intended as a *Trial* of his Virtue, *i. e.* of his Patience and Self-denial, any further than as thoſe Virtues are concerned in bringing every Thought into Captivity to the Obedience of *Chriſt*. It was as a Trial of his *Faith*, whether it was ſtronger than his natural Affection; and he had Reſolution enough to give a Proof of it at the Price of what was the moſt dear and valuable to him in Life: It was an infinitely harder Trial than that which ſtaggered the young Man in the Goſpel;—"Sell "all that thou haſt—and come and follow "me, and when he heard this he was ex- "ceeding ſorrowful; for he was very rich," *Luke* xviii. 18. Here was an only Child, the Son of his Love, of his Hopes, and the Heir of the Promiſes demanded and readily given up. The End was worthy for which he ſhould do it. It was to partake of the Benefits of the Death of the Son of God; and by it he gave not only as to himſelf the moſt valuable,

luable, but to every body, the exacteſt Figure of the Sacrifice of the Son of God.

When we view the Sacrifice of *Iſaac* in this Light all Difficulties vaniſh. Why was he demanded as a *burnt Sacrifice*, and the Father order'd to offer up his beloved Son? The Father ſtood in God's Stead, and gave up his Son *inſtead* of the Son of God; as a Proof of his own Faith, and a Leſſon of Inſtruction to the Unbelievers of that Time, and a ſtanding Evidence to that and all future Generations; that not a *Lamb*, but a *Man*, and that not *Iſaac*, but a Seed that was to deſcend from him, was to bear the Wrath of God for all Men. Why is the Scripture ſilent as to the *Deſign* with which *Abraham* offered up his Son? Becauſe Sacrifices were the Type, the known Type, and had no other View and Intention. Does *Abraham* expreſs no Surprize at this hard Trial, nor expoſtulate with God upon it? He knew the Son of God was to be given for him, and ſhould he refuſe his Son to God?

Here could be no Encouragement to human Sacrifices. The Sacrifice of *Chriſt* made them unneceſſary: ſuppoſing human Sacrifices were ever ſo common in *Canaan*, [which if they were not when *Abraham* lived, they were when *Moſes* wrote] this Command neither gave Encouragement

ragement to the Cuſtom, nor would the Frequency of it have leſſened the Merit of *Abraham*'s Faith and Obedience; but was a direct Condemnation of the inhuman Cuſtom, and the Commonneſs of it an Addition to the Merit of *Abraham*'s Faith. He offered up his Son as a *Type* of the Son of God; they who offer'd up theirs, did it as *Originals*: He to the true God, they to the falſe. If *one was to die for all*, which *Abraham* bore Teſtimony to; then they who ſacrificed their Children diſowned the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*, and denied the Faith which is in him. It is *obeying* God that pleaſes him, not acting from *Imagination*, as they did who offer'd up their own Children; ſuppoſing it poſſible any Believer could offer up his Son to God as *Abraham* did, he muſt act againſt the very Nature and Deſign of the Types, which was as a *perpetual Memorial*, as I ſaid, that God would offer up his Son for them all. *Abraham*'s acting from an expreſs Command doth not in the leaſt juſtify *another*'s acting without ſuch a Command: But *Abraham*'s offering up his Son as a Figure of him who was to atone for his Sins, in Oppoſition to the Country he lived in, when *all* denied the Neceſſity of the great Sacrifice he gave this Teſtimony to, ſhews his heroic Courage,

who durſt ſtand in Defiance of the whole World, and profeſs his Faith in *Chriſt*, tho' all Mankind were againſt him. To ſwim with the Stream is eaſy, but to check the Torrent of Cuſtom, and Madneſs of Infidelity, a harder Taſk, and Matter of greater Reſolution than I am afraid moſt People are Maſter of, let the Truth be ever ſo clear to them. But ſuppoſing that human Sacrifices were now common in *Canaan*, ſay you, Sir, " how was *Abraham* a greater Example of " Piety, in reſpect of his God *Jehovah*, than " the heathen Worſhippers were in reſpect " of thoſe falſe Deities? p. 45. Why not at all. They did as much to their Gods, as he did to his. So did the Worſhippers of *Baal*, as much for him, as *Elijah* did for *Jehovah*: Nay more, they cut themſelves with Knives and Lances, which *Elijah* had too much Senſe to do: What follows? That *Abraham*'s and *Elijah*'s Merit was not greater than that of thoſe Idolaters? Or, does this take away their Merit, or *bear hard upon the Scripture Hiſtory of* Abraham *or* Elijah? I am at a Loſs to know what middle Term is to connect theſe two Propoſitions: To ſuppoſe you could imagine the Heathens were as great Examples of Piety, as Believers, when they did as much for their Gods, as they for *Jehovah*;

Jehovah; would be making you ſay, that the Object of Worſhip was entirely out of the Queſtion, and that it matter'd not whether it was *Jehovah* or *Baal* they worſhipped, provided one did as much as the other; and yet, unleſs this be ſaid, What is all the Contention about the Date of human Sacrifices to the Purpoſe? or how is the Honour of *Abraham*, and the Credit of his Faith concern'd in the Diſpute? The Difference betwixt *Abraham* and thoſe Idolaters is, that the one offered his Son that he might be ſaved by *Chriſt*, the others, that their Children might atone for their Sins; the one was in the right, the other in the wrong: The one adher'd to a God who could reward him; the other to ſuch as could not. The one had Authority for what he did, the other had only Imagination for it.

We come now to the Dependency between the two Diſpenſations (*Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian*) as they chuſe to call the Faith in *Chriſt* typified by outward Signs. But in the firſt Place, thoſe Terms of *Dependency* and *Connection*, and ſo forth, either have no Meaning, as they are uſed, or aſſert a Falſhood. What is there to connect the two Diſpenſations, or how doth one depend on the other; if, according to you, the one is *Works*, and the

other *Faith?* *This do and live*, ſays the one: *Believe and thou ſhalt be ſaved*, ſays the other. *Works* and *Faith* are *toto Cælo* different; either the *Jewiſh* is the ſame with the *Chriſtian* Diſpenſation, Faith in *Chriſt* being the Terms of Salvation to both *Jew* and *Chriſtian*; or it differs from it as much as Light from Darkneſs; and there is no more Dependency of one upon the other, or Connection between them, than there is Likeneſs in Worth or Quality between the Merits of the Sufferings of *Chriſt*, and thoſe of the ſacrificed Oxen and Sheep. If they knew nothing of the Death and Merits of *Chriſt*, is it not falſe to ſay, the Diſpenſation they were under, depended upon, or was connected with the *Chriſtian*, which is Faith in thoſe Merits? Doth not being under a *Diſpenſation* mean the being *ordered*, *directed*, or inſtructed to act ſo and ſo, upon ſuch Principles, for ſuch Ends? and of Courſe, thoſe under the Diſpenſation, muſt know the Meaning of what they are about; and ſo, if the *Jews* were in *Covenant* with God, they muſt know it, and muſt know alſo, what they were to do on their Part, and what God was to do on his Part; or elſe they were no more in Covenant with God than Stocks and Stones: And the *Hottentots* are as

much in (the *Chriſtian*) Covenant with God as the *Jews* were, and may as well be ſaid to be under a Diſpenſation, that is *connected* with the *Chriſtian*, as the *Jews* can be. No, ſay you, the *Dependency ariſes from God's Intention, that the commanded Action ſhould import or repreſent the Sacrifice of* Chriſt, and not *from* Abraham's *or the* Jews *knowing it.* (*c*) Is Religion for the Sake of God Almighty then? Was he under the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation? The *Dependency* is to appear to God by this Sacrifice of *Iſaac*; and the People under the *Diſpenſation* are to know nothing of it: In other Words, The Faith in *Chriſt* is *diſpenſed* to them, at the ſame Time that it is not *diſpenſed*, *beſtowed*, or *diſtributed*; in ſhort, that is the ſame *unmeaning* Way of Talking, as that before taken Notice of, in the *Uſe* of the Words *predicted*, *prefigured*, *foretold*, and the like; and if they who talk in this Manner, would but aſk themſelves, What they mean by a *Covenant* or *Diſpenſation*, they would ſoon ſee that they talk Nonſenſe, or directly contradict themſelves, when they lay down ſuch Propoſitions as I have been now conſidering. However, we will ſuppoſe the Phraſes to be Senſe, and that by a Dependency on, or a Connection of the Religion of

(*c*) Exam. Page 55.

the *Jews* with that of *Chriſtians*, is meant, that the Sacrifice of *Iſaac*, and of the periodical Lamb afterwards, is a Proof or Evidence that God did intend his own Son ſhould be ſacrificed for us. This, you ſay, the Types were a Proof of, whether they knew the Meaning of them or not. But how, or which Way could they be any Evidence for *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles againſt the unbelieving *Jews*? *Chriſt* argues with them, as do the Apoſtles, that the *Meſſiah*, their promiſed Redeemer, was to paſs through Death into his Glory; that his Kingdom was not of this World; that their Sacrifices, and particularly the Sacrifice of *Iſaac*, was a Proof that the Son of God was to lay down his Life for all Men; that a Bone of him *was not to be broken*, becauſe a Bone of the *Lamb* was not; that he was to ſuffer without the Gate, becauſe the burnt Offerings were conſumed there, *&c.* The *Jews* argue that Sacrifices were the *real*, *original* Atonements, and deny that any other Sacrifice was neceſſary to Salvation. How was the Diſpute to be decided; by their Scripture? No, it ſeems the Old Teſtament is wholly ſilent on the Head. *Abraham* and his Poſterity had never heard of any ſuch Doctrine; the Faith therefore of their Church, from the

firſt to the laſt, is againſt *the Truth, a Prejudice* which it would have been impoſſible to have overcome; and the Silence of Scripture an Argument not to be reſiſted. Could not the *Jews* have eaſily anſwered *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles — Were it as you pretend, would not the Scriptures have given us plain Intimations about it? Would God have left us in the Dark in a Matter of this Conſequence? *Abraham* and the Prophets *believed* the contrary of all this, they were juſtified: Will God require a greater Degree of Faith of us, than he did of the Father of the Faithful? On what Authority then do you build this *novel* Doctrine?

And as the Law of *Moſes* could be of no Uſe to *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, in Proof of his divine Miſſion, ſo neither can it be of any Uſe in our Diſputes with Unbelievers now; who muſt argue on the ſame Footing as the *Jews* did: To the Old Teſtament we can't ſend them, it ſays nothing about it: nor can we appeal to the New, *becauſe Unbelievers are not bound to accept it; the Authority of the Writers of the New Teſtament*, ſay you, as *inſpired Men, is with them the main Point in Queſtion* (*d*), and ſo we have Nothing but meer Imagination to help us, *viz.* the

(*d*) Exam. Page 61.

Similitude between the *Tranſaction* and the *Event* (*e*) : And this can be no Evidence, for this plain Reaſon, becauſe it is interpreting *ex poſt facto* ; beſides that, it opens a wide Field to the Sallies of Fancy, which, when deſtitute of a Guide, knows not where to begin, or where to end. But, pray Sir, Why may not the Authority of the New Teſtament be made *uſe of to aſcertain the Type ?* Why, *Unbelievers* diſpute that Authority, you ſay ; then prove the Authority of the Writers of the New Teſtament, as inſpired Men, from their Miracles, *&c.* to them firſt ; ſurely this may be done. And perhaps, they will then be competent Judges of the Meaning and Intention of God, and good and proper Guides to us, in interpreting the Types, and all the *Jewiſh* Ceremonies : And they with one Voice tell us, that the Law was *ſpiritual*, and was deſigned to pre-deſcribe *Chriſt*, and what he was to do for us : by which the Church from *Adam* downwards were inſtructed in the true Faith ; and their Faith made Evidence for Chriſtians now, as to all the grand Points, *viz.* a Trinity, Covenant of Grace, Incarnation and Satisfaction for Sin, made by the Death and Sufferings of our Saviour *Chriſt*, who, as God incarnate, was

(*e*) Exam. Page 55.

capable

capable of performing all Righteouſneſs. To the Law and Religion of the *Jews* we find the Apoſtles always appealing, and repreſenting it as the firſt and principal Evidence for Chriſtianity. Let the Reader look back to p. 25, and the following.

But, ſay you, *if you want the New Teſtament Authority to aſcertain the Type, you cannot bring back the Type again as Evidence for that Authority* (*f*).—*It is a mere Petitio principii* (*g*). Nobody does, that I know of, bring the Type for the Authority of the New Teſtament, but for Proof that the Meſſiah was to die as a Sacrifice for Sin; that a Bone of him was not to be broken; that he ſhould be laid in a clean Tomb; ſhould riſe again the third Day, and aſcend into Heaven; that he is to return from thence to raiſe, judge, and reward his faithful Subjects; this may be all proved againſt Jews and Infidels, from the Old Teſtament, from the Types, and alſo from the Prophecies: It may be proved that this was always the Faith of the Church of God; who taught *Adam* this Creed, and inſtituted proper Means to keep up this Faith among his Poſterity: And though you are pleaſed to ſay, "There is no ſuch Bible (old Teſtament) Proof to be found, *p.* 63". yet

(*f*) Exam. Page 61. (*g*) Page 63.

ſuch

ſuch Bible Proof *has been found*, and produced in great Plenty, and when any body will attempt to ſhew that inſufficient, more ſhall be produced. The Scripture has alſo ſhewn us how the Defection from this Religion came about, which at laſt became general, though it was many Years firſt. *Job*, who lived in *Arabia*, long before *Moſes*, ſpeaks of the grand Points of Chriſtianity in the very Language and Phraſeology of the New Teſtament: Indeed it is *impoſſible* to ſpeak *plainer*, *ſtronger*, and more *poſitively* than he does. *Balaam*, when the Children of *Iſrael* came out of *Egypt*, was a Prophet of *Jehovah*, which is a Proof that there was a true Church in *Meſopotamia* at that time; as there was in various other Places, long after that. It was the Types that kept up the true Faith wherever it was kept up: And if our Divines would ſtudy the *Hebrew* a little more, they would ſoon ſee that there wants not Bible Proof to aſcertain the Meaning of the Types; and when it is ſhewn that the Church always believed in Chriſt, and therefore ſuch and ſuch Ceremonies were always obſerved to pre-deſcribe him, then the *Type* is Demonſtration againſt Jew and Gentile, whoſe Anceſtors *once* had this Faith: And the Reaſon appears, why our Lord and the Apoſtles cite and apply in the

the manner they do, ſuch Paſſages out of the Old Teſtament, *as by their proper Light alone could hardly have the Senſe put upon them well aſcertained.* Prophet, Prieſt, and King were but Perſonaters of Chriſt, and their Actions Deſcriptions of what he was to do; and ſurely it is very natural to inſert Promiſes with regard to *Chriſt*, and allude from the correſponding Circumſtances in them to him; and what was ſo ſaid and done to or by them, was very intelligible; for all Men had their Eyes on them, as thoſe who acted in the Name and Character of another, on whom their Hopes were fixed: and eaſily might, as they readily did, take the Hint. I will give an Inſtance or two.

2 *Sam.* vii. 12. The Prophet *Nathan* comes to *David* in the Name of God — "I will ſet "up thy Seed after thee, which ſhall proceed "out of thy Bowels, and I will eſtabliſh his "Kingdom. He ſhall build an Houſe for "my Name, and I will eſtabliſh the Throne "of his Kingdom for ever. I will be unto "him a Father, and he ſhall be unto me a "Son: If he commit Iniquity, אשר בהועתו, "I will chaſten him with the *Rod of Men*, "and with the Stripes of the Children of "Men, בני־אדם." This Propheſy is applied *Heb.* i. 5. and every Word is applicable, and looks

looks beyond *Solomon*, in whom it had a *literal* or figurative Completion; and muſt have ſo, or it could not be a Figure of *Chriſt*; i. e. had there not been *Circumſtances* in *Solomon*'s Hiſtory parallel to thoſe in our Lord's, the one could not have been a Figure of the other, and the (*ſecondary*) Prophecy could not have been given. *Solomon* was to reign, ſo was *Chriſt*. *Solomon* was to build the Temple, a Type of the Body of *Chriſt*; *Jehovah* in *Chriſt* to build the real Houſe or Temple of God, in which he was eſſentially preſent. God was a Father to *Solomon* in the metaphorical Senſe; to the Man *Chriſt* in Reality, by forming the Humanity in the Womb, *i. e.* begetting the Man *Chriſt*. *Solomon* went aſtray, and was ſcourged as a Father doth a Child, with a Rod that it was proper for human Creatures to be chaſtiſed with; *Chriſt* was to ſtand in the Sinners ſtead, to become Sin, and bear the Rod of Men, and receive the Stripes of the Sons of *Adam*; *i. e.* the Stripes due to them, and the Words anſwer to both Senſes, אשר בהעותו, is either, *whom when* he ſins, or whom when he *is made* Sin. *David* underſtood this Propheſy to relate to the Meſſiah, as appears by his Prayer, *ver.* 18. " Who am I, O Lord *Jehovah?* and what " is my Houſe, that thou haſt brought me " hi-

" hitherto? and this was yet a ſmall thing in " thy Sight, O Lord *Jehovah*; but thou haſt " ſpoken alſo of thy Servant's Houſe for *a* " *great while to come:* And this is תורת the *Law*, [Diſpoſition, *Deſcription*] of the Man, the Lord *Jehovah*." As if he ſaid—What am I, O Lord, to have ſo great an Honour conferred on me, as to be Father of the Man, the Lord *Jehovah*, of whom thou haſt now ſpoken to thy Servant? This was underſtood by others, as appears from *Pſal.* lxxxix. *ver.* 30, *&c.*

Iſaiah vii. 14. is another ſecondary Prophecy—" A Virgin ſhall conceive, and bear " a Son, and his Name ſhall be called *Imma-* " *nuel*." The Words here anſwer the double Senſe. This Prophecy muſt have an outward Completion, or there would have been no Figure to have made uſe of. A Woman, who was a Virgin when the Prophet ſpoke, is to marry, have a Child, and call it *Immanuel.* This promiſes to *Ahaz*, what he then deſpaired of, Deliverance from the Danger which then threaten'd the immediate Deſtruction of the Houſe of *David*; *Iſaiah* goes on, Butter and Honey ſhall he (the Child) eat, till he knows to refuſe Evil and chooſe Good, *i. e.* that he ſhould live in great Plenty, till the Child not yet born, nor his Mother

ther as yet married, come to Years of Diſcretion, ſo the Nation was ſecure for the preſent. But the Prophecy was to have a further Completion, and a Virgin was to conceive, and bear a Son, and that Son was to be *God* and *Man*. How were they to gather this from the Prophecy? From almoſt every Circumſtance of it. The Cuſtom had long prevailed, of recording in the Names they gave their Children, the Attributes and Offices of him on whom their Hopes were fixed. *Noah*, Comforter. *Shem*, Ruler. *Abraham*, Father of the Faithful. *Joſhua*, God, the Saviour. *David*, Beloved. *Solomon*, Giver of Peace: and ſo on. עמנואל is *God with us*, or, *God with him*, viz. the Child. As ſurely as they named a Child *Immanuel*, ſo certainly did they believe that God would really be united with a Child: And the Name by Cuſtom as readily brought that great Perſon, who was to be God and Man, to their Minds, as it did the Child they gave this commemorative Name to. Had the Mother of the Child named *Immanuel*, in *Iſaiah*'s Time, been a Virgin when ſhe conceived, the Child had not been a Figure or Type of the Son of God, but would himſelf have been the *Son of God*: For had a Virgin conceived, it muſt have been

by the divine Power, and the Child, as *Chriſt* was, the real Son of God.

This ſecondary Prophecy is worded in the ſame manner as the ſupernatural Conception of *Chriſt* would have been, had that only been ſpoken of: But from the Nature of ſecondary Prophecies muſt have ſomething *external* to anſwer it. The Prophet's Words, *a Virgin ſhall conceive*, are poſitive. But as to the then preſent or figurative Completion could mean no more, than that *one then a Virgin ſhould have a Child:* and muſt mean ſo much, or the Words had had Nothing to anſwer them in the Figure. Calling the Child *Immanuel*, was no more making him *God and Man*, than calling his Mother a Virgin [as ſhe was when the Prophet ſpake] made her a Virgin when a Mother, as was the Mother of our Lord. So the Sign, *a Virgin ſhall conceive, and bring forth a Son, and his Name ſhall be* Immanuel, which *Iſaiah* tells the King, God himſelf would give them, fully anſwered the preſent Occaſion, and led them at the ſame Time to the Thoughts of, or brought to their View the God-man, who only was *Immanuel*, and in Commemoration of whom ſuch Names had always been given to their Children; and it muſt have been Blaſphemy, to have given ſuch Names as *Elijah*, *Immanuel*, and many others

others to their Children, had they not deſigned thereby to have commemorated him to whom the Attributes, expreſſed in thoſe Names, belonged. Why is it to be ſuppoſed, that Nobody knew before this Prophecy, that *Chriſt* was to be born of a Virgin? Doth not the firſt Mention of him in Scripture call him *The Seed of the Woman?* Doth not the frequent calling him *Son of God*, imply his Mother was to be a Virgin? We make the Church of God as ignorant of *Chriſt* almoſt, as the wild *Indians*; and then pretend to be amazed at Infidels for laughing at us, for bringing for Evidence dark Hints and Alluſions, which we allow neither the People, nor the Prophets themſelves underſtood. The *Jews* when *Chriſt* came, had almoſt loſt the Knowledge of the Covenant, and the Meaning of the Prophecies that relate to the Completion of it; but this is no Reaſon that their Anceſtors were as ignorant as they.

Another Prophecy of the ſame Kind with the laſt is, that we meet with, *Mat.* ii. 23. He came and dwelt in a City called *Nazareth*, that it might be fulfilled which was *ſpoken* of the Prophets, he ſhall be called Ναζωραιος, *a Nazarite.*" We don't find it any where ſaid, in plain Words, that *Chriſt* ſhould

ſhould be an Inhabitant of *Nazareth*, or a *Nazarene*; and ſo explain it, by ſuppoſing it expreſſed *equivocally* in the Word נצר, a Branch which is applied to our Lord in *Iſaiah*, and this City is ſuppoſed ſo named from its Fruitfulneſs; but נצר has no Relation to Fruitfulneſs; and only ſignifies a Scion or young Plant, as it is *preſerved*, or reſerved when the other Wood is cut down; or as it is *fenced* and *guarded* round; and is applied to other Things for the ſame Reaſon, as *Iſaiah* i. 8. to a beſieged City, and lxv. 4. to Tombs. And there is no Reaſon from the Fruitfulneſs of *Nazareth* to ſuppoſe, that the original Name of this City is taken from this Word. We will ſuppoſe then the Word to be נזיר which Nobody would have doubted, had it not been for the Solution of this difficult Text, by the above Quibble or Pun: Then עיר נזיר is in *Engliſh*, *The City of the* Nazarite; and St. *Matthew* ſays, that *Chriſt* dwelt at *Nazareth*, to fulfil what was predicted by the Prophets, that he ſhould be a *Nazarite*. That *Chriſt* was to be a *Nazarite*, is predicted in Numbers of Places, every one that took that Vow upon them was a Figure of him, and conſequently predicted it. The City was named the City of the *Nazarite*,

in Memorial of his being to dwell there. It's Name ſhews it. It was the Cuſtom to name *Places*, as well as *Perſons*, to record the Truths relating to *Chriſt*; and all underſtood, or might have underſtood this Cuſtom of their Country, as before obſerved. *Chriſt fulfilled all Righteouſneſs*, *viz.* typical Righteouſneſs before he entered on his Miniſtry, and therefore muſt have fulfilled this Type alſo, as to its outward Letter, whilſt he dwelt at *Nazareth*, for he dwelt there till he had compleated all, except being baptized or waſhed, *See Mat.* iii. 15. and therefore dwelt at *Nazareth* to be a *Nazarite*. But it may be aſked, Might he not as well have dwelt at *Capernaum* to be a *Nazarite*? How then had this been the City of the *Nazarite*, as its Name expreſſeth? According to the Cuſtom of ſuch Names, it *muſt* imply either that the City ſhould be the *Nazarite*, or that the *Nazarite* ſhould dwell there: One or the other it muſt ſignify: or elſe, Why was this City named the City of the *Nazarite*? our Lord's bare reſiding in this City was no Completion of the Predictions, that he ſhould be Ναζωραιος, a *Nazarite*; nor does what St. *Matthew* ſay, imply it was: He ſays, "He "went and dwelt at *Nazareth*, that what

"was

" was ſaid by the Prophets, of his being to " be a *Nazarite*, might be fulfilled." Had it been ſaid—He dwelt at *Capernaum*, that it might be fulfilled, *he ſhall be a* Nazarite; the Reaſon and Connection had not appeared; but—" He dwelt at the *City of the Naza-* " *rite* to fulfil the Prophecies of his being " a *Nazarite*;" here the Connection beſpeaks itſelf in the Name of the City. But then it is true, thoſe who gave this Name to the City, muſt know that *Chriſt* was to be *the Nazarite*: and that he was to be ſo, as he really was, at that City; and if this was known, St. *Matthew*'s ſaying, the Prophecies of his being to be a *Nazarite* were fulfilled by his dwelling there, lyes very plain and obvious; obvious to every ſenſible *Jew*, who underſtood the Cuſtom of his Country, [or the Reaſon why ſuch Names were given] and that there could be but ONE NAZARITE. We find the Devils as well as the *Jews* in general, knew our Lord to be the *Nazarite*, or Holy One of God, whilſt he dwelt at *Nazareth*, and before he enter'd on his Miniſtry, and perform'd Miracles, *See Mar.* i. 24. How did they know this, but by his performing all Righteouſneſs whilſt he dwelt at *Nazareth*? I know thee, who thou art, ſays the Evil Spi-

rit, *Jeſus of Nazareth*, the Holy One of God; as if he had ſaid, I know thee, becauſe thou art *Jeſus* the *Nazarite* of *Nazareth*.

When our Lord entered on his Miniſtry he left *Nazareth*, and came and dwelt at *Capernaum*, which is upon the Sea Coaſt in the Borders of *Zabulon* and *Nephthalim*: that it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by *Eſaias* the Prophet, ſaying, "the Land of *Zabulon*, "and the Land of *Nepthalim*, the Way of the "Sea beyond *Jordan*, *Galilee* of the *Gentiles*, "the People which ſat in Darkneſs ſaw a great "Light: and to them which ſat in the Region "and Shadow of Death Light is ſprung up, "*Mat.* iv. 14." And this Text is thought not explicit enough to be interpreted of our Lord's Reſidence and Preaching in theſe Parts, and beginning his Miniſtry here. But this was literally fulfilled when they ſaw *Chriſt* and his Light firſt ſhined out there, when the Light of *Iſrael* began to preach the Goſpel of the Kingdom of Heaven in theſe Parts; and thoſe who lived when *Iſaiah* predicted it, and thoſe who lived when St. *Matthew* applied it, *muſt*, or *might*, know it ſpoke of the Meſſiah's converſing with theſe People, becauſe *he*, and *he only*, throughout the Scriptures, is the Light

ight or Glory of the *Gentiles* and of *Iſrael*, whom all Men then expected; and *Light* is the expreſs Image of his Perſon; it is the Character of the Divinity in *Chriſt*; it deſcribes him as *Ezekiel* ſaw him, chap. i. 27. upon a Throne encircled with Glory or Light; [נגה, the Word here uſed] *Brightneſs round about* him — "This was the Ap- "pearance of the Likeneſs of *the Glory Je-* "*hovah*," or *the great Light*. This was the Glory of *Jehovah*, which *Lev.* ix. 23. and many other Times was ſeen by all the People: and therefore, they could not but know, that the *great Light* was the *God-man*, the Man whoſe Body was the Temple or Houſe of the Glory: whom, whoſoever ſhould ſee, would ſee *the Father*, the God of Glory.

In that famous Prophecy of *Micah*, chap. v. which the *Jews* themſelves applied to the Meſſiah, it is ſaid— that *his* מוצאתי [Sendings forth, as the Stream does Water, and the Sun Light, for ſo the Word is uſed] *Directions*, *Rule*, *Influences*, have been מקדם *from the firſt*, *from the Days* עולם *of old*; not from Eternity: But in *former Times*, as *Iſaiah* uſes the Phraſe lxiii. 9. "He bare them, "and carried them all the Days עולם of old:"

which implies they were acquainted with that Perſon under whoſe Influence and Directions they had lived from the very firſt. We have ſuppoſed of late, that the Prophecies, [ſuch as thoſe I have been conſidering] were given for the *Information of the then Times*, imagining that they knew Nothing of *Chriſt*, but what was taught them by thoſe ſhort Speeches and dark Hints; but this is abandoning the Ark of God, and giving up our Strength into the Enemy's Hand; truly the Infidel may well aſk, What Certainty there is in ſuch Obſcure Predictions? What Streſs to be laid on ſuch Riddles?

But to return to the Types, which though allowed *to be ſome how or other* deſcriptive and predictive of *Chriſt*, are ſuppoſed not to have been underſtood by thoſe, whoſe Salvation was to depend upon the Obſervance of them; and who are commanded to make them their perpetual Study, and the Subject of their Thoughts and Converſation, when they ſat in the Houſe, or walked by the Way; when they lay down or roſe up; and to teach them diligently unto their Children: yet theſe People are ſuppoſed not to have underſtood the Myſtery in them, *plain* and *obvious* as it lyes: But if they did not, or could

not

not underſtand them, how impertinent is the Application of them, ſo often to our Lord, and the Circumſtances of his Hiſtory, without any formal Explication or Preface! *John* ii. 19. " Deſtroy this Temple, and in three Days " I will raiſe it up—he ſpake of the Temple " of his Body;" and chap. vi. 31. " He " gave them Bread from Heaven to eat;"— " I am the living Bread which came down " from Heaven;" ver. 51. " He that be- " lieveth on me, as the Scripture has ſaid, out " of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of Living " Water;" chap. vii. 38. " There ſhall be " one Fold and one Shepherd;" chap. x. " ver. 16. They brake not his Legs —that " the Scripture ſhould be fulfilled, a Bone " of him ſhall not be broken," *John* xix. 36. A Bone of the Paſchal Lamb was not to be broken; but had they not known that the Paſſover was a Figure of the Crucifixion; to what Purpoſe had it been to produce this Scripture, as a Prediction of this remarkable Particular? In the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, all the principal Points of the Law are applied in the ſame Manner, as Proofs of *their* Faith; and Evidence for us; *they being Figures for the Time then preſent*—" Almoſt all " Things are by the Law purged with Blood;

" and without ſhedding of Blood is no Re-
" miſſion—So *Chriſt* was once offered to bear
" the Sins of many, *Heb.* ix. 22, 28." All that the Prieſt did in the Sanctuary, nay, all he did *as Prieſt*, was known to be deſcriptive of what *Chriſt* was to do, the Prieſt being but his Repreſentative. Now, conſider the Law in this View, as the outward *Expreſſion* of their Sentiments, and the ſtrongeſt Evidence will ariſe from it for Chriſtians; and it will be thence *certain* that the Meſſiah was to die as a Sacrifice, riſe again, and ſo forth. In the Prohibition of not breaking a Bone of the Paſchal Lamb, was predicted, that a Bone of *Chriſt* when crucified, ſhould not be broken: The other Rites and Ceremonies of the Paſſover predicted other Particulars; " In the
" tenth Day of the Month they ſhall take—a
" Lamb — without Blemiſh, a Male of the
" firſt Year—ye ſhall keep it up until the four-
" teenth Day—the whole Aſſembly ſhall kill
" it in the Evening,—ſtrike the Blood on the
" two Side-poſts, and on the upper Door-poſt.
" Eat the Fleſh roaſt with Fire—ye ſhall let
" nothing of it remain until the Morning--no
" Stranger [till circumciſed] ſhall eat thereof
" —in one Houſe ſhall it be eaten, thou ſhalt
" not

" not carry forth ought of the Fleſh abroad " out of the Houſe — no uncircumciſed Per- " ſon ſhall eat thereof; one Law ſhall be to " him that is home-born and unto the Stran- " ger, *Exod.* chap. xii."—The Sacrifice ſhall " be eaten the ſame Day that he offereth his " Sacrifice; and on the Morrow alſo the Re- " mainder of it ſhall be eaten; but the " Remainder on the third Day ſhall be burnt " with Fire: if it be eaten at all on the " third Day, it ſhall not be accepted, the Soul " that eateth of it ſhall bear his Iniquity." *Lev.* vii. 16, *&c.* Theſe and ſuch like Particulars, ſay you, Sir, " were *intended* by " God Almighty to *ſhew a Dependency* be- " tween the Law and Goſpel, and that we are " to prove this Intention of God only from " the *Similitude* and *Correſpondency* between " the *Events* and *Tranſactions* by which they " were prefigured. *Hiſtory of Abraham, p.* 55. A Dependency between the two Diſ- penſations, if it has any Meaning, muſt mean, that thoſe who are under the two Diſpenſa- tions, depended upon the ſame Hopes; and if the *Event* was *prefigured*, it was deſcribed before-hand; and if the Deſcription was not to be underſtood, it was his Fault who drew the Picture. As to proving the divine Inten-

tion

tion in the Types; the *Similitude* and *Correſpondency* may explain the Particulars, ſhew us how to apply or help us to explain the Circumſtances of the Sacrifice; but is no Proof that the Sacrifice itſelf was intended as a Type: And accordingly, you yourſelf make it only *probable*, " it yields a ſtrong " Probability, that this did not happen by " chance--I call this a ſtrong Probability, I go " no farther ;— but theſe and all other Types " *ſpeak* to us *only* who live under this laſt Diſ- " penſation, for whoſe Inſtruction *alone* they " were intended (*f*)." What they inform us of, you have told us p. 58, namely, " that " from the Days of *Abraham*, it had been *fore-* " *appointed* or *foreordained* of God, that *Chriſt* " ſhould be offer'd up as a Sacrifice." We know that Preſcience is an Attribute of God, and therefore are demonſtrably certain, that God always *pre-deſigned* it; to what Purpoſe is it then to prove, that God pre-deſigned it from the Time of *Abraham*, *Moſes*, or *&c*? That it was fore-appointed of God, that *Chriſt* ſhould ſuffer, there can't be the leaſt Poſſibility of diſputing; nor does it ſignify to the *Evidence of Chriſtianity*, to know that God had in *his ſecret Counſel* fore-appointed it,

(*f*) Exam. Page 65, 66, 67.

it, provided we know that God has done it; and what a Banter is it on the Wiſdom of God, to ſuppoſe he would conſtitute ſuch a vaſt Variety of Types, only to *make it probable* to People who ſhould live ſome Thouſands of Years afterwards, and who don't one in a Million underſtand them, that it was *fore-ordained* ſo and ſo? We who have ocular Proof, a plain hiſtorical Narration of the Completion of every Particular that was predeſcribed, and ſo want not the Picture, as having the Original before our Eyes, are to have the Picture; and they who wanted the *Original* are denied the Picture; or which is the ſame Thing, are not told who the Picture was drawn for. The Types are repeated ten times ten Millions of Times, and Million upon Million of Beaſts ſlain, *to ſpeak to them only*, for their Uſe only and Information, who were never to ſee them, have not one in a Million, take the Chriſtian World through, from the firſt to theſe Days, any adequate Notion, in what Form, Manner or Proceſs they proceeded iu them; nor are able to explain or apply the Hundredth Part to the Things ſignified: nay even——are in doubt whether the Hundredth Part has any Meaning.

When

When Men of the greateſt Parts, greateſt Learning, and greateſt Zeal for the Honour of God and Religion, can *gravely* talk in ſuch a *Strain*, and give ſuch weak and more than childiſh Accounts of the Tranſactions of God with Man, one can't help ſtanding amazed at it, to think how ſuch Blindneſs could happen to them. Is not this Contagion caught from thoſe Sons of Darkneſs, the Apoſtate *Jews*, who were under a judicial Blindneſs? for from thoſe Men has the Explication of the Law of *Moſes* been chiefly collected and handed down, from Man to Man, amongſt Chriſtians, by Men otherwiſe greatly eminent, who without Examination tranſmit it to each other, and think the Authority of him that preceded, ſufficient to juſtify their giving ſuch Accounts, and to ſcreen them from the Trouble of giving Reaſons for what they ſay. It is enough, if a *Grotius*, *Epiſcopius*; a *Bull*, or a *Sh*— have ſaid ſo and ſo, and *it is hard upon me to be called upon to juſtify it, I am not at leiſure.* It is true, it is much eaſier to borrow at ſecond Hand, and tranſcribe what others have ſaid, than enter into a tedious Diſpute about the Truth and Propriety of it: Though every Man is bound in Juſtice

to

to the Truth and to Himſelf, to give his Reaſons for what he aſſerts in Print, and defend, or give it up when properly called upon.

I am, SIR,

Your moſt obedient humble Servant,

JUL. BATE.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAGE 36. l. 8. ſhould be pointed thus, viſible. That —l. 15. dele *by*. p. 37. l. 16. after Engliſh, add a Comma. p. 40. l. 11. after why, add a Comma. p. 53. l. 17. for *that*, read *this*. p. 56. l. 22. read, were *themſelves*. p. 59. l. 25. בהעותו. l. penult. בני אדם. p. 61. l. penult. for he, read *they*.